

telephone service resellers and their markets to fully disclose the long distance service carrier that they offer, and to disclose their actual relationship to the long distance carrier advertised. I invite my colleagues to join me in supporting these important consumer protections, which particularly impact small businesses.

The need for this legislation arose as a result of the increasingly competitive long distance telephone market in which companies known as resellers offer long distance telephone service in a variety of discounted plans. Sometimes they have their own lines and offer long distance service plans; sometimes they buy blocks of telephone line time from AT&T, MCI, Sprint, or one of the large long distance carriers at a discount, repackage them, and market them as discount plans. This is a legitimate industry and can save consumers and small businesses money on their long distance service.

In recent months, however, small businesses have been receiving calls, letters, and unsolicited faxes from firms offering discounted long distance telephone service. In many cases, these solicitations lead the customer to believe that the reseller is merely an extension of the existing carrier, by advertising "AT&T Long Distance for Less" or by calling themselves the "AT&T Corporate Discount Plan." But in fact the reseller may have no connection with AT&T, and may even have no intention of consistently providing repackaged AT&T service, choosing instead to shop around for the cheapest long distance time to resell to the customer.

Thinking that they are getting a good deal from a subsidiary, small businesses, many of which work on a very tight margin and need to pinch pennies wherever they can, jump at the chance to save money on their long distance telephone service. Unfortunately, they do not get what they expect. As it turns out, the firm which sold them the service has no connection to AT&T or MCI or Sprint. The unsuspecting small business has had its long distance service provider changed, and is none the wiser—until there is a problem.

Small businesses, like Jan Electronics in New London, CT, depend on their telephones—particularly their 800 service—as their lifeblood. What happens if something goes wrong? What happens if their 800 lines go down? Whom do they call? In many cases, since they think they have AT&T, they will call AT&T, only to be told, "No, you are not our customer; those are not our lines." Upon calling the local exchange carrier, the customer finds out that in fact their long distance service provider is a company they have never heard of. Just to discover this information they have lost precious time, sales revenue, and who knows how many customers. What is worse, the time was wasted just looking for the right place to get service. The problem has not begun to be fixed.

In recent months, the Federal Communications Commission, which regulates interstate telephone service, has received more than 650 complaints about misrepresentation by resellers. Because it is a new matter, the FCC has issued no regulations, and tries to handle each complaint on a case-by-case basis. So far, they have had little or no success in stopping the problem.

The legislation I am introducing today would require long distance resellers and their

agents to disclose their actual relationship to the long distance carrier they are selling—if there is a relationship at all. Resellers will not be able to advertise "the AT&T discount plan" if they are not providing AT&T service, nor can they represent themselves as an MCI company if they are not. The bill further requires resellers to disclose the name of the actual interexchange carrier or long distance carrier to the customer. This will mean that small businesses will know exactly whose service they are getting and whom to contact when there is a problem with service.

This legislation will protect consumers and small businesses by requiring that complete information on their long distance service be provided by resellers. Furthermore, this legislation will be good for the telephone resale industry. By weeding out the bad apples, credibility can be restored and legitimate businesses can more easily market their services.

GATT: THE NEED FOR CARIBBEAN INCLUSION

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 26, 1994

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to draw my colleague's attention to a statement made by Ambassador Richard Bernal of Jamaica regarding the importance of passing the Caribbean Interim Trade Program [ITP] in the GATT implementing bill this year. Ambassador Bernal made this statement at a workshop on U.S./Caribbean relations that I hosted during the recent 24th annual legislative conference for the Congressional Black Caucus Foundation.

By working to expand mutually beneficial trade linkages between the United States and the Caribbean, the ITP will strengthen the framework for long-term economic growth and development in the Caribbean. This is of crucial importance, not only in sustaining economic growth in many communities throughout the United States, but in laying the economic foundations for peace and long-term political stability throughout the region.

As my colleagues consider United States policy towards the Caribbean in the coming days, I would urge them to review this piece to gain insight on the importance—to both the United States and to the Caribbean nations—of a healthy and vigorous commercial partnership.

Mr. Speaker, I submit Ambassador Bernal's statement for the RECORD.

REMARKS BY H.E. DR. RICHARD BERNAL, AMBASSADOR OF JAMAICA ON THE CARIBBEAN INTERIM TRADE PROGRAM, SEPTEMBER 15, 1994

A. STATUS OF THE CARIBBEAN INTERIM TRADE PROGRAM

The ITP was proposed for inclusion in the GATT bill by the Clinton Administration in May, 1994. The GATT bill is now in the Joint Conference to work out differences between Senate and House versions of the bill. The Conference is scheduled to be completed by next Wednesday, September 21, and the Administration hopes to introduce a final bill to the Congress by Monday, September 26.

The ITP is contained in the House version of the GATT bill, and is strongly supported by acting Chairman Gibbons and the House

Conferees. The ITP is not contained in the Senate version of the GATT bill, although many Senate conferees support the ITP and the expansion of the \$25 billion U.S./Caribbean trade relationship.

To guarantee enactment of the ITP as part of the GATT bill this year, the Senate must recede to the House position on the ITP.

B. REASONS WHY THE CBI INTERIM TRADE PROGRAM IS NEEDED

Growth promotion

The Interim Trade Program (ITP) will result in an expansion of the CBI, a program that has promoted growth in the United States and the Caribbean over the past decade. Over 50 percent of GDP growth in the United States since 1987 has been generated by export growth, and the Caribbean Basin represents the region where U.S. exports have grown most rapidly. In 1993, the United States posted its eighth consecutive trade surplus with the Caribbean with the U.S. registering a 100 percent increase in exports to the CBI since 1983. Combined bilateral trade now exceeds \$22 billion a year. Additionally, under the CBI Program Caribbean exports to the United States have expanded by 40 percent stimulating growth throughout the Caribbean region.

Employment creation

The CBI program has provided 16,000 new jobs annually, a total of nearly 250,000 jobs over the last 10 years. The interim trade program will insulate those jobs from potential erosion that will be caused as Mexico's preferential access to the United States under NAFTA leads to trade and investment diversion from the Caribbean.

U.S. competitiveness

The interim trade program will enhance U.S. competitiveness, especially in the textile and apparel industry. Garments produced in Jamaica are 70 percent U.S. origin and 30 percent Jamaican. Such complementarity of production means that the U.S. garment industry can manufacture price competitive garments to maintain an internationally competitive position. In this way, the U.S. garment industry will be able to compete effectively in the global market place with low-wage, non-American manufacturers who do not use American textiles, labour, or inputs.

Promote regional security

The interim trade program will enhance regional security. The U.S. border with the Caribbean and Central America, is often breached by illegal immigrants and drug traffickers. Poverty creates an environment which spawns such illegal activities. The ITP will help to provide economic alternatives to such activities and support regional peace, stability, and democracy by stimulating sustained economic growth.

The Interim trade program will serve as a cost effective foreign and economic policy instrument. The predicted erosion of fiscal revenues due to the lowering of tariffs will be more than offset by the increased revenues yielded by U.S. employment gains and export growth. Moreover, the ITP will create the trade-based economic growth model and reinforce economic reform that can support regional development as foreign aid to the region is further reduced.

Improved market access

The interim trade program improves U.S. market access to the Caribbean by providing for the negotiation of bilateral investment treaties (BITs), intellectual property rights (IPR) agreements, special market access commitments, and strengthened environmental and labour standards. Such agreements will not only provide for a stable and predictable framework for U.S./Caribbean re-

lations, but it will also lead to improved performance for U.S. investors and exporters in the Caribbean.

C. REASONS WHY THE CBI INTERIM TRADE PROGRAM IS NEEDED NOW
Consistent with GATT

The GATT is a perfect legislative vehicle for the interim trade program because the ITP is consistent with the principles enumerated in the GATT bill. The ITP will lead to expanded market access and trade liberalization—two principles at the heart of the GATT deal. The interim trade program will also help the U.S. and the Caribbean garment industries meet the challenges presented by GATT's 10-year phase-out of the

multi-fiber arrangement which governs textile and apparel quotas.

Complementary to NAFTA

The interim trade program will serve as an urgent and needed transitional arrangement that can help restore a level playing field between Mexico and the Caribbean Basin countries vis-a-vis the U.S. market. If the interim trade program is not enacted soon, the Caribbean countries and US-CBI trade will suffer serious trade and investment diversion.

GATT bill

The 1994 GATT Implementing Bill is the only trade bill that Congress will consider during 1994. It is imperative that the interim trade program be passed as part of the GATT

bill. If GATT is delayed, or if the interim trade program is left off the GATT bill, there will be no other opportunity to pass trade legislation. This will place in jeopardy the U.S./Caribbean trade partnership.

Presidential commitment

The Interim Trade Program represents a fulfillment of the commitment, made by President Clinton to the Prime Ministers and Presidents of the Caribbean and Central America, to ensure that countries of the CBI region would not be adversely affected by the implementation of the NAFTA. It is important that Congress and the Administration follow through on this commitment to the region.

U.S. EXPORTS TO CBI COUNTRIES BY STATE, 1987-1993

(In thousands of U.S. dollars, unless otherwise noted)

State	1987 Exports	1993 Exports	Dollar change	Percent change
Alabama	111,485.6	199,386.8	87,901.2	78.8
Alaska	4,200.9	4,305.4	104.5	2.5
Arizona	9,157.7	14,556.4	5,398.7	58.8
Arkansas	19,624.3	53,349.7	33,725.4	171.9
California	331,242.2	379,055.9	47,813.7	14.4
Colorado	40,036.4	21,458.2	-18,578.2	-46.4
Connecticut	47,811.0	114,874.2	67,063.2	140.3
Delaware	14,113.7	20,282.2	6,168.5	43.7
Florida	2,622,685.8	4,305,116.5	1,682,430.7	64.1
Georgia	327,990.0	619,108.4	291,118.4	91.7
Hawaii	1,043.1	1,775.3	732.2	70.2
Idaho	668.6	2,794.4	2,125.8	317.9
Illinois	118,247.9	222,718.8	104,470.9	88.3
Indiana	33,278.6	54,156.6	20,878.0	62.7
Iowa	22,357.4	37,167.9	14,810.5	66.2
Kansas	16,564.1	45,455.0	28,890.9	174.1
Kentucky	20,833.9	57,929.9	37,096.0	178.1
Louisiana	776,725.6	937,730.4	161,004.8	20.7
Maine	5,168.4	25,555.2	20,386.8	394.5
Maryland	30,607.7	43,609.6	13,001.9	42.5
Massachusetts	65,572.7	84,460.3	18,887.6	28.8
Michigan	44,588.1	74,014.3	29,426.2	66.0
Minnesota	51,721.4	65,827.6	14,106.2	27.3
Mississippi	100,205.6	200,205.8	100,000.2	99.8
Missouri	49,240.7	82,085.2	32,844.5	66.7
Montana	136.3	649.6	513.3	376.6
Nebraska	6,275.8	11,245.6	4,971.8	79.2
Nevada	3,674.5	5,772.3	2,097.8	57.1
New Hampshire	34,694.3	43,678.5	8,984.2	25.5
New Jersey	184,790.0	253,648.9	68,858.9	37.3
New Mexico	13,447.4	5,916.5	-7,530.9	-56.0
New York	367,855.2	584,627.2	216,772.0	58.9
No. Carolina	148,783.4	571,660.4	422,877.0	284.2
No. Dakota	1,001.1	1,206.5	205.4	20.5
Ohio	96,324.6	183,525.4	87,200.8	90.5
Oklahoma	16,824.3	36,775.2	19,950.9	118.6
Oregon	5,144.4	13,807.8	8,663.4	168.4
Pennsylvania	142,292.8	204,439.4	62,146.6	43.7
Rhode Island	8,152.6	10,652.3	2,499.7	30.7
So. Carolina	104,379.6	172,625.0	68,245.4	65.4
So. Dakota	525.9	1,139.1	613.2	116.6
Tennessee	77,462.3	172,855.8	95,393.5	123.1
Texas	868,078.9	1,330,582.6	462,503.7	53.3
Utah	3,901.7	5,243.5	1,341.8	34.4
Vermont	1,354.7	6,809.3	5,454.6	402.2
Virginia	121,251.4	213,593.7	92,342.3	76.2
Wash. DC	2,166.1	4,746.0	2,579.9	125.3
Washington	40,756.4	143,141.1	102,384.7	250.9
West Virginia	3,588.7	8,887.3	5,298.6	147.6
Wisconsin	56,489.9	93,341.9	36,852.0	65.2
Wyoming	8.0	6,186.6	6,178.6	77,232.5
Total	7,184,505.7	11,752,337.5	4,567,831.8	63.6

Source: Adjustments to Data from U.S. Census Bureau, Foreign Trade Division by Massachusetts Institute of Social and Economic Research; University of Massachusetts

FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE FOR 1993

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 26, 1994

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, it has been my custom to submit a statement of financial disclosure every year in which I have served in the House of Representatives. While the law now dictates that Members of Congress submit financial disclosure statements in May of each year, I also continue to file this detailed family financial report as I have since 1971. In this way, my constituents are kept fully and completely informed concerning my financial status and that of my family.

Romano L. and Helen D. Mazzoli Income—
Calendar Year 1993

Salaries and fees:		
U.S. House of Representatives (R.L. Mazzoli) ...	\$133,600.00	
Alexandria Drafting Co. (Helen Mazzoli)	30,211.20	
Total salaries and fees	163,811.20	
Interest, Dividends, Rents and Distributions:		
Congressional Federal Credit Union:		
No. 62976-0 (Member/Savings)79	
No. 62976-1 (Member/Checking)	1.01	
No. 84720-0 (Spouse/Savings)	45.44	
No. 84720-1 (Spouse/Checking)	168.25	

Congressional Federal Credit Union:	
Certificates of Deposit (Spouse):	
No. 32256	17.78
No. 32257	29.00
Interest on Matured Certificates of Deposit (Spouse):	
No. 25778 (Matured 10/19/93)	155.59
No. 25799 (Matured 10/19/93)	253.74
First National Bank and Trust Co.:	
No. 427-5518-4 (Joint/Special Account)	3.91
Liberty National Bank and Trust Co.:	
No. 00922663 (Member/Checking)	176.78